Dr. Dr. h.c. Hans Kochler
University Professor, Chairman of the Department of Philosophy
University of Innsbruck, Austria

The "Clash of Civilizations": Perception and Reality in the Context of Globalization and International Power Politics

Lecture delivered at the

International Forum on

Globalization and a Dialogue between Civilizations

organized by

Georgian National Commission for UNESCO
International Black Sea University
Tsereteli Institute of Oriental Studies (Georgian Academy of Sciences)
Georgian International Foundation for the Support of Education and Solidarity in Business-Life
Intercultural Dialogue Platform (KADIP)

Tbilisi, Georgia, 30 September – 1 October 2004

V3/03-10-2004

(I)

In an Appeal adopted on 14 July 1995, at a time when world leaders had begun speaking of a "New World Order," the International Forum for Solidarity against Intolerance, held in Tbilisi under the auspices of UNESCO, diagnosed "a new global threat of aggressive intolerance" which, according to the participants, can only be overcome through a "new culture of tolerance" as essential part of a dialogue of cultures.[1]

This diagnosis is even more relevant today when regional conflicts, systemic contradictions and disparities of the global order have become more acute. One of the basic disparities of contemporary international relations seems to lie in the globalized economy's trend towards *uniformity* as opposed to the *diversity* and self-assertion of a variety of cultures and civilizations.

Globalization as a tendency – or "globality" as a fact of international relations – is characterized by the interdependence of all geographical regions and all aspects of social life at the same time.[2] The driving force behind this new reality[3] is "economic competition without borders" that has mainly become possible due to the end of the East-West conflict, i.e. the collapse of the bipolar order that divided the world along ideological lines and military alliances. This process has been greatly facilitated – and the speed of globalization has been enormously increased – by the rapid development and spread of communication technology, particularly through the Internet. It cannot be denied, however, that this dynamic process of economic interaction has been accompanied by a tendency towards *cultural uniformity* – whether in regard to language, "lifestyle," or social habits in general.

---

[1] Tbilisi, Republic of Georgia, 14 July 1995. Document provided by UNESCO, program "Culture of Peace," at www.unesco.org/cpp/uk/declarations/tsbilisi.pdf.

[2] On the nature of globalization see the author's paper "Philosophical Aspects of Globalization – Basic Theses on the Interrelation of Economics, Politics, Morals and Metaphysics in a Globalized World," in: Hans Kochler (ed.), *Globality versus Democracy? The Changing Nature of International Relations in the Era of Globalization*. Vienna: International Progress Organization, 2000, pp. 3-18.

[3] The phenomenon as such is not entirely new. Trends towards globalization existed in previous centuries in relation to the colonial and imperial powers' efforts at opening up virtually all known regions of the globe to international trade. In terms of quantity and intensity, however, the globalization of the 20th/21st centuries is a new phenomenon.

In its *Global Agenda for Dialogue among Civilizations*, the United Nations General Assembly apparently tried to stem the tide of uniformization which is inherent in the economic dynamic of globalization. In the resolution adopted on 9 November 2001, the UN member states described the fact that globalization brings "greater interrelatedness among people and increased interaction among cultures and civilizations,"[4] but they also identified the threat of uniformity faced by the world's cultural and civilizational traditions, emphasizing that

> "globalization is not only an economic, financial and technological process which could offer great benefit but … it also presents the challenge of preserving and celebrating the rich intellectual and cultural diversity of humankind and of civilization."[5]

The *contradictory nature of globalization* is expressed in the fact that so many groups of people, belonging to different cultural and/or civilizational traditions,[6] strive to interact with others at the global stage while at the same time trying to *preserve* their national, ethnic, cultural, and civilizational identity. The dynamic of this process has brought about what I would like to characterize as "split cultural consciousness;" it characterizes the predicament so many communities are faced with under the conditions of today's "global village."

The *attitudes* shaped by the dynamics of globalization somewhat mirror this split consciousness:

–   On the one hand, globalization, out of economic necessity (that is determined by "competition without borders"), brings about a basic open-mindedness and "businesslike" attitude towards different languages, value systems and lifestyles, that may encourage tolerance towards other civilizational expressions (even if, in many circumstances, at a superficial level); as rightly argued by Qurong Shen, "the progress of globalization has

---

[4] General Assembly, fifty-sixth session, agenda item 25, A/RES/56/6, adopted at the 43rd plenary meeting, 9 November 2001.

[5] Loc. cit.

[6] The term "civilization" is used here in the more general sense as defined, for instance, by Samuel Huntington. According to this definition, civilization means "the highest cultural grouping of people and the broadest level of cultural identity people have short of that which distinguishes humans from other species." (Samuel Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations?," in: *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 72, No. 3, Summer 1993, p. 24.) In the context of this paper, we understand "culture" as a sub-category of civilization.

set the basic context and major theme" for a global dialogue of civilizations.[7]

–   On the other hand, the dynamic of globalization generates a somewhat antagonistic tendency towards *uniformity*, or "uniformization," for the simple reason of efficiency. This attitude is at the expense of the erstwhile trend towards intellectual openness and respect for other civilizations. Whether it is the emergence of *one* language as *lingua franca* (to the detriment of distinct cultural traditions) or the propagation of uniform lifestyles and social trends associated with the preponderant language's socio-cultural environment: a tendency towards uniformity is obviously not in conformity with the precepts of a dialogue between cultures and civilizations; it tends to generate, or enforce, *hegemonial* structures on a global level.

The danger associated with this overall trend, one of the most debated characteristics of globalization, has been aptly described by the Group of Eminent Persons appointed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations with the task of working out guidelines for a dialogue among civilizations. In their final report, the experts voiced the concern that "[a] process of globalization without dialogue may increase the probability of hegemony."[8]

The forms of reaction to this trend towards uniformity, associated by many with a global hegemonial agenda, are determined by a desire for reasserting the importance of national cultures, traditions, forms of expression, value systems, etc. This desire will often be accompanied by a profound distrust of, and at times even aggressive attitudes towards, "alien" cultures and lifestyles that may be propagated – or may "impose" themselves in the perception of others – in the process of globalization. The widespread social repulsion of the new forms of cosmopolitanism transported by globalization should not catch anyone by surprise. In a fashion similar to the individual subject, the dynamic of the *collective subject*

---

[7] Qurong Shen, "Dialogue among Civilizations: Implications for International Relations," in: *Xandai Guoji Guangxi* [Contemporary International Relations], Beijing: China Institute of Contemporary International Relations, September 2001 (translation from the Chinese original).

[8] "The dialogue among civilizations." *Executive Summary* of the publication of the Group of Eminent Persons appointed by the United Nations Secretary-General on the occasion of the United Nations Year of Dialogue among Civilizations, www.un.org/Dialogue/summary.htm (2001).

develops through an *actio-reactio* scheme in which every force triggers a counter-force as a result of the subject's efforts to preserve its identity.[9] This essentially *dialectic* process must be taken into account if one intends to understand the cultural or civilizational identity crisis that has been brought upon so many communities in connection with the ever more rapidly advancing process of globalization.

The *political reality* at the global level (including the military power constellation) more and more mirrors the uniformist tendency of globalization: since the end of the Cold War, the international system has been characterized by the *absence* of a balance of power. At least for the time being, unipolarity has replaced the bipolarity of the post-World War II era. This political unipolarity may have been reinforced by the dynamic of globalization (which is itself prone to hegemony as described by the UN experts mentioned earlier).

The unipolarity at the political level is somewhat juxtaposed to the cultural and civilizational *multipolarity* which is also part of the present global system – and which has become even more obvious as a result of the communication technologies that have been rapidly advanced in the process of globalization. The different kinds of rivalries, disputes and conflicts that are related to this multipolarity – or associated with multipolarity by apologists of certain theories – have so far been resistant to all efforts of "political homogeneization."

In spite of the "stubbornness" of cultural and civilizational communities (as regards the preservation of their heritage), political unipolarity tends to impose its laws also on those traditions. At the civilizational level, one cannot ignore the hard facts of global power relations any more: whether it is the propagation of certain notions of human rights and democracy, or the effort at imposing social trends associated with the prevailing economic system, those concepts and habits are made part of a *legitimation discourse* by which the predominant power backs up its claim to global leadership, postulating for itself some form of civilizational supremacy. This applies to all areas of interaction between states including war. Not only in recent history have issues of values and civilizational identity served to

---

[9] On the various aspects of this dynamic cf. Hans Köchler (ed.), *Cultural Self-comprehension of Nations*. Tübingen/Basel: Erdmann, 1978.

justify armed conflicts. Unavoidably, civilizational justification has made such conflicts even more intractable.

In terms of power relations, the present unipolarity has the potential of triggering so far dormant civilizational conflicts – or fuelling them even further where it has not been possible to contain them through conventional measures of politics and diplomacy. As recent history has amply demonstrated, the *perception*, or postulation, of civilizational conflicts in the transnational realm (as regards the relations between Islam and the West, for instance), while resulting, to a certain extent, from conflict situations at local or regional levels, may itself aggravate existing ethnic and/or religious conflicts in particular regions. The events in former Yugoslavia (since the 1990s), in the South of the Philippines (Mindanao), or in Iraq (since 2003), to mention only a few examples, are proof of this interdependent relationship.

At the beginning of the 21st century, when the traces of the ideological rivalry between East and West are fast receding into history, the *new danger* to global order lies in the paradigm of a "clash of civilizations" becoming the vehicle of a "post-ideological" justification of international conflicts.[10] If the civilizational paradigm is being used as cover for the pursuit of a policy of national interests (whether by the dominant global power or by regional powers), everyday conflicts may acquire a quasi-metaphysical dimension, which will make conflict resolution infinitely more difficult and, according to the *actio-reactio* scheme of social relations referred to earlier, may further aggravate the problem of international terrorism instead of containing it.[11]

Looking back at the history of international relations, we may recall that the era of global bipolarity (which prevailed during the entire period of the Cold War) was characterized by a "clash of ideologies," namely between capitalism (or liberal democracy)

---

[10] For a general analysis of the implications of civilizational disputes for international relations see Hans Kochler and Gudrun Grabher (eds.), *Civilizations – Conflict or Dialogue?* Studies in International Relations, XXIV. Vienna: International Progress Organization, 1999.

[11] By reverse argument, as outlined by the participants of the international symposium on "Dialogue of Civilizations: Theory and Practice," held in Tunis, a dialogue of civilizations will be "an efficient means for fighting terrorism" in all its forms. (*Tunis Appeal on "Dialogue among Civilizations,"* 13 November 2001. Islamic Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, www.isesco.org.ma.) – On the paradigm of the clash of civilizations and the phenomenon of international terrorism see the author's paper "After September 11, 2001: Clash of Civilizations or Dialogue?," in: *Forum. Popular na pahayag ng malayang komunidad* (Universidad ng Pilipinas), Diliman, Q. C., Tomo 3, Blg. 3, 28 March 2002, p. 9.

and socialism. Although regional conflicts had broken out and were, in most cases, conducted as proxy wars in the context of superpower rivalry, the two competing powers essentially held each other in check, which not only meant an almost total paralysis of the United Nations Security Council, but also *mutual deterrence* preventing war between the two rival powers, indeed averting another world war.

The antagonistic scheme of the bipolar era has not altogether disappeared in the unipolar constellation of the present time; the clash of ideologies has been replaced, at least in the perception of influential sectors of the international public, by one among civilizations. The problem, in regard to global order, lies in whether, and to what extent, *perception creates reality*, i.e. a *perceived* clash among civilizations becomes something of a self-fulfilling prophecy. The crucial question as to the future world order will be how this dynamic, i.e. interdependent, relationship between perception and reality will unfold.

In a unipolar environment such as the present one, that is characterized by the absence of a balance of power, the advocates of international *realpolitik* (which, frankly speaking, is a synonym for old-fashioned power politics) will be tempted (at least as far as the predominant power is concerned) to make use of the confrontational paradigm to advance specific political, economic and military goals, and they may do so without too much fear of repercussions that would naturally have to be considered in a bipolar or multipolar environment. The by now innumerable invocations of Huntington's notion of the "clash of civilizations" since the tragic events of September 11, 2001,[12] are vivid proof of this connection. The political unipolarity of the present global system may reinforce, in certain cases even create, civilizational antagonisms that might otherwise have been subdued by ideological rivalries between two or more competitors for global power.

The political and military actions that are being *justified* (by the actors) or *explained* (by the observers) by reference to Huntington's notion, may make of the *perceived* clash of civilizations a transnational *reality*; what may have existed as mere perception will have become political reality by fiat of an essentially ideological interpretation and/or legitimation of events. A major example of the overall political impact of this

---

[12] His original essay was published in 1993. (See note 6 above.) For the sake of accuracy it must be stated that the term was originally used by Bernard Lewis: "The Roots of Muslim Rage," in: *The Atlantic Monthly*, vol. 266, September 1990, p. 60.

interdependence – with most serious implications for global peace – is the state of relations between the Muslim world and the West.[13]

Two aspects have to be differentiated as regards the *actio-reactio* scheme underlying this interdependence of perception and reality:

(1)   The perception of a threat may be calculated as being necessary for mobilizing the public in favour of a certain political agenda advancing a country's national interests vis-à-vis its neighbours and/or the rest of the world; this agenda may also include the use of military force. The latter will have to be justified as measure of legitimate self-defense in order to become acceptable in the eyes of the domestic as well as international public. In this context, the notion of the "clash of civilizations" may be part of a *rationalization* of otherwise undeclared interests. This is particularly relevant in regard to the rather vague notion of "preventive self-defense" (which has experienced a not so surprising *renaissance* in the present global constellation and is now invoked with increasing frequency by major regional powers).

(2)   The other aspect relates to antagonistic action from the part of those who are identified by the states(s) or groups referred to under (1) as posing a threat to national and, eventually, international peace and security. This counter-action may amount to:

(a) a reassertion by those countries and/or communities (groups) of their identity vis-à-vis the dominant culture or civilization (this is what I would like to call "*reactive self-assertion*");

(b) the "targeted" countries or communities taking action, understood as self-defense, against those international actors that are perceived as propagators of a dominant civilization for the sake of advancing their national interests.

---

[13] Cf. Hans Kochler, "Muslim-Christian Ties in Europe: Past, Present and Future," in: *IKIM Journal*, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, vol. 7, no. 1 (January-June 1999), pp. 97-107.

The danger, in regard to global order, lies in this interdependence of action and reaction becoming a vicious circle of *threat perception* (i.e. diagnosis of a threat) on the one hand and *measures of defense* against the perceived threat on the other, whereby the latter may finally make the threat a reality, leading to even stronger countermeasures and further strengthening existing enemy stereotypes. Thus, the paradigm of the clash of civilizations may become a self-fulfilling prophecy; it may be the "unintended consequence" of otherwise containable conflicts of interests.

At this juncture in history, the world is facing the very real risk of entering a cycle of *mutually reinforcing enemy stereotypes* (or threat perceptions) and related "defensive" actions along civilizational lines – a cycle to which there will be no end in sight once it has been triggered off (as there may be no end to what is being called the "global war on terror" which unfortunately, in certain respects, appears to run parallel to confrontations perceived by an increasing number of people as being related to their civilizational identity).[14] The increasing alienation between the West and the Muslim world (whether along the civilizational "fault lines," diagnosed by influential analysts, in the Near East, the Middle East, Central Asia, or South-East Asia) is just one more indicator of this trend.

(II)

One will have to reevaluate the chances of a just and stable global order against this rather bleak background of the *dialectic of perception and reality*, i.e. the cycle of threat perception and defensive action related to it. One of the questions that have to be asked will be whether and in what sense efforts at a genuine dialogue among civilizations will contribute to breaking this cycle of inter-civilizational confrontation (in the places where it has already begun to destabilize the regional order) – or preventing it from becoming a reality of *global* affairs.

---

[14] On the problem of terrorism in the socio-political context cf. Hans Kochler, "Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism: Towards a Comprehensive Approach," in: *Manila Lectures 2002. Terrorism and the Quest for a Just World Order*. Quezon City: Foundation for Social Justice, 2002, pp. 29-42.

A lot will depend on how the *dynamic of globalization*, which by now appears to be an established fact of international relations, works out over the medium term. Let us recall: in the context of globality, civilizational multipolarity has become part of everyday life – mainly due to the rapid development of communication technologies. How much does this multipolar reality, resulting from the dynamic of the globalization process, bear on international politics which is essentially determined by "national interests" and the drive for the preservation and aggrandizement of power?

Can globalization "neutralize" these realities and the confrontational paradigms related to them – or at least "absorb" them in the wider context of economic interests the universality of which is one of the basic characteristics of a globalized world? May it be realistically hoped that the forces of globalization, out of economic necessity, will gradually transform the "clash" of civilizations towards an essentially cooperative system? (Intellectual analysis and moral exhortation alone will certainly not be sufficient to make a difference.)

Furthermore: can the dialectic between *unipolarity* in terms of power relations and *multipolarity* (or, in specific regional constellations, *bipolarity*) in terms of civilizational identities be gradually overcome through the very dynamic of globalization – against and in spite of its tendency towards cultural uniformity (that may, in turn, foster a hegemonial agenda and has undoubtedly been used for that purpose in the past)? By its very nature, the process of globalization has opened a *cosmopolitan space* of economic, social and cultural interaction, a development which cannot easily be undone. It has created a new "social reality" at the transnational level with far-reaching implications for the regional and domestic order everywhere.

In this regard, attention should be drawn to the *normative aspect* of the international system: Will a *synthesis* between the antagonistic forces of civilizational self-assertion eventually be achieved through a normative consensus? Could the forces representing civilizations agree on the basic requirements of *co-existence* as a minimum set of norms, thereby abandoning, on the basis of mutuality, any effort at subjecting each other to missionary strategies and tactics? And could such a consensus also be applied to the complex relationship between civilizations as part of a multipolar global reality on the one

hand and the forces representing the unipolar power constellation at the political level on the other? Will the civilization that benefits most from the present political unipolarity be prepared to apply the principle of mutuality? In this context, the corresponding values of *freedom* and *tolerance* would figure as central elements of a set of meta-norms which are to be understood as *conditio sine qua non* for the self-realization of every civilization;[15] such a relationship between norms and meta-norms (whereby the latter figure as precondition for the realization of the former) is structurally similar to that underlying the doctrine of peaceful co-existence among nations (states) with different ideologies (that prevailed in the earlier bipolar era).[16]

These normative considerations make an *agenda of global dialogue* more convincing than merely political arguments which, by their very nature, will always be "opportunistic" and related to a more or less transitory situation. The implementation of an agenda of dialogue is quintessential not only for the self-realization of each and every civilization, but for the survival of all nations. It alone will help avoid endless confrontation that would finally defeat all civilizations' and nations' interest in self-preservation, including that of the Western civilization which appears to benefit most from the unipolar political constellation of today (and, thus, might be less inclined to appreciate the normative argument of mutuality).

In line with this argumentation (which may be considered part of the *philosophia perennis* of mankind, and not exclusively of Western civilization), I would like to recall the words of the Appeal adopted in Tbilisi in 1995:

> "It is necessary to develop a new culture of tolerance through the perception of a newly interrelated world in which the security of everyone is based on mutual understanding, confidence and co-operation."[17]

The Group of Eminent Persons appointed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations has emphasized another important aspect of inter-civilizational relations, stating

---

[15] For further details of this normative relationship see Hans Köchler, *Cultural-philosophical Aspects of International Cooperation. Lecture held before the Royal Scientific Society, Amman-Jordan* [1974]. Vienna: International Progress Organization, 1978, esp. chapter III: "In search for what is common to all systems." – See also Hans Köchler (ed.), *Cultural Self-comprehension of Nations*. Tübingen/Basel: Erdmann, 1978.
[16] On structural questions of the global political order cf. the author's paper: *The Dialectic of Power and Law. The United Nations and the Future of World Order*. Occasional Papers Series, No. 8. Vienna: International Progress Organization, 2004.
[17] Loc. cit.

that a "dialogue between those who perceive diversity as a threat and those who see it as a tool of betterment and growth is intrinsically necessary."[18]

Through this reference to the somewhat *dual face* of civilization (as regards the evaluation of civilizational diversity), the experts have drawn our attention to the fundamental challenge faced by the international community of today, namely of preventing the paradigm of the "clash of civilizations" from becoming a self-fulfilling prophecy. The dialectical nature of threat perception (which we have referred to earlier) may entangle civilizations – and the nations or national communities associated with them – in a *circulus vitiosus* of self-assertion and self-defense from which there will be no easy way out:

A diagnosed threat may trigger a real confrontation, thus reversely making the threat an actual one – which then, *post factum*, will be used to justify the earlier acknowledgment of a threat. This vicious circle constitutes one of the most serious dangers to regional as well as global peace.

Partly due to the absence of a global balance of powers, the peoples, social and ethnic communities of many regions of the world, indeed mankind as such, are threatened by being divided along cultural or civilizational lines. The ever growing problem of terrorist violence is intrinsically linked to the conflictual paradigm. The alienation between social and cultural groups within and between regions is further reinforced by the uncontrolled dynamic of conflicts of interests, disputes over sovereignty issues, economic rights, etc., on the domestic, regional and international levels. Culture or civilization are often not the primary cause of such confrontations, but are being used as *vehicle* of such conflicts, thus functioning like a magnifying glass.

At the same time, somewhat juxtaposed to this conflictual context in which civilization is being instrumentalized, culture or civilization are being cherished as tools, or measures of last resort, to counter what many people describe as *loss of social identity* resulting from globalization and the related political unipolarity.

As regards *civilizational identity*, one may discern two mutually reinforcing trends:

---

[18] Group of Eminent Persons appointed by the United Nations Secretary-General on the occasion of the United Nations Year of Dialogue among Civilizations, *Executive Summary*, loc. cit.

(a)   Civilizational identity is being reasserted to compensate for what many perceive as a loss of, or threat to, their social identity resulting from the trend towards uniformity of lifestyles brought about by globalization.

(b)   At the same time, civilizational identity is being exploited to serve as basis of justification for political disputes, conflicts of economic interests, etc., that are initially triggered by the international actors' desire not only for self-preservation, but a tendency to increase their power over that of the competitors.

The *structural dynamic* of globalization may be a factor in overcoming such confrontations although, in certain respects, globalization, as hinted earlier, may itself generate civilizational conflicts according to the *actio-reactio* scheme of civilizational self-assertion (which means that the trend towards global uniformity is countered by increased emphasis on a specific culture or civilization). On a sustainable basis, however, the only antidote to a looming "clash of civilizations" on the global level will be the propagation of *enlightenment* in a genuine philosophical sense, contributing to the creation of mutual awareness for each other's civilization through a systematic *policy of dialogue* to be supported by all members of the international community. The General Assembly of the United Nations has aptly described this basic requirement of global peace as

> "a process *between* and *within* civilizations, founded on inclusion, and a collective desire to learn, uncover and examine assumptions, unfold shared meaning and core values and integrate multiple perspectives through dialogue."[19]

A civilization will only reach maturity if it engages in *genuine* (as distinct from opportunistic, politically expedient) dialogue, i.e. if it is able to relate itself to other civilizations.[20] In conformity with the *dialectical* nature of human consciousness, a

---

[19] Loc. cit. (emphasis by the author).

[20] This may include structural comparison in many different fields. In regard to Islam and Christianity, efforts have been made to reach a better mutual understanding by referring to the concept of monotheism shared by the two religions. See Hans Kochler (ed.), *The Concept of Monotheism in Islam and Christianity*. Vienna: Braumüller, 1982. Cf. in particular the message by His Eminence Franz Cardinal König, p. 3.

civilization can only fully comprehend, and thus define, itself by setting its parameters in distinction from, though not rejection of, the *alter ego* of co-existing civilizations.[21]

By this way alone will the members of the "civilizational community" become immune against the manifold adversarial stereotypes that are being propagated by those who seek advantage over their competitors in the global struggle for economic and political influence. *Mutual respect* among civilizations embodies the true Enlightenment which is not merely the heritage of 18th century Europe, but has been part of universal history comprising *all* civilizations and religions. It is due to this attitude, if at all, that the foundations of "perpetual peace" in the meaning expounded in Immanuel Kant's classical essay[22] will be established.

It is reasonable to assume that the *knowledge* of and *tolerance* towards other civilizations, resulting from the former, will make it less likely that "perception does become reality" – so that the paradigm of the clash of civilizations will be confined to the realm of *ideological constructs* where it originally belongs. This doctrine, being itself an offspring of the ideological strife of earlier decades, runs not only counter to the full realization of each civilization but has, in the meantime, been instrumentalized for political battles on the domestic and regional levels as well as for the global power struggle triggered by the sudden collapse of the bipolar balance of power.

In the globalized environment of the 21st century, the dialogue among civilizations has become the most important *desideratum* of world peace. In view of the destructive capabilities amassed not only by the traditional competitors for global power, the states, but also by non-state actors, it has rapidly become an issue of collective survival.

Under the changing circumstances of international security which are evidenced by the looming "global war on terror," a kind of permanent conflict which may see no winner, civilizational dialogue embodies the very norms governing the relations between nations that, in a previous era and in a different context of ideological rivalry, were represented by the doctrine of peaceful co-existence among nations.

---

[21] For details see the author's paper *Philosophical Foundations of Civilizational Dialogue*, loc. cit.

[22] Immanuel Kant, *Zum ewigen Frieden. Ein philosophischer Entwurf* [1795]. Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1992. English edition: *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Essay*. Translated with an introduction and notes by M. Campbell Smith. Bristol: Thoemmes Press, 1992.

It is the noble duty of philosophy to expound the common system of values that are shared by all civilizations and the recognition of which is the indispensable condition for every civilization's existence and self-realization on the basis of mutual respect. No one can live in peace unless he accepts the *reciprocity* of his right to live his own life and express his civilizational identity without interference or intimidation. It is the simple *value of mutuality* that is at the roots of civilizational dialogue.[23]

If practiced in a consistent, credible and sustainable manner, the dialogue may expose the political agenda behind supposed cultural and civilizational conflicts and prevent a hitherto unseen perpetual confrontation between peoples, nations, and groups of nations in the name of civilization.

---

[23] Former German Federal President Roman Herzog has emphasized the quintessential importance of mutuality, or reciprocity, and has characterized it as the "golden rule" of civilizational dialogue. Cf. Roman Herzog with comments by Amitai Etzioni, *Preventing the Clash of Civilizations. A Peace Strategy for the Twenty-first Century*. Ed. by Henrik Schmiegelow. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999, p. 43.

Papers and publications by the author on civilizational dialogue

○ *CULTURAL-PHILOSOPHICAL ASPECTS OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION.* Lecture held before the Royal Scientific Society, Amman, Jordan [1974]. (Studies in [Cultural] International Relations, II.) Vienna: International Progress Organization, 1978.

○ (Ed.) *CULTURAL SELF-COMPREHENSION OF NATIONS.* [International Symposium, Innsbruck, 1974.] (Studies in International [Cultural] Relations, I.) Tübingen/Basel: Erdmann, 1978.

○ (Ed.) *THE NEW INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION ORDER. Basis for Cultural Dialogue and Peaceful Coexistence among Nations.* (Studies in International Relations, X.) Vienna: Braumüller, 1985.

○ "THE INTERNATIONAL ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY. THE COMMUNITY OF RESEARCHERS AND THE INTER-CULTURAL DIALOGUE. A PHILOSOPHICAL OUTLINE," in: *Academic Forum. Institute of African Studies, Seminar Proceedings: University and Academic Freedom. What Do They Mean? University of Bophuthatswana. May 6-7, 1993.* Mhabatho: University of Bophuthatswana, 1993, pp. 13-18.

○ "IL CONCETTO DI NAZIONE E LA QUESTIONE DEL NAZIONALISMO. LO "STATO-NAZIONE" TRADIZIONALE E UNA "COMUNITA-STATO" MULTICULTURALE," in: Tiziano Bonazzi and Michael Dunne (eds.), *Cittadinanza e diritti nelle società multiculturali.* Bologna: Il Mulino, 1994, pp. 53-65.

○ "THE CONCEPT OF THE NATION AND THE QUESTION OF NATIONALISM. THE TRADITIONAL 'NATION STATE' VERSUS A MULTICULTURAL 'COMMUNITY STATE'," in: Michael Dunn and Tiziano Bonazzi (eds.), *Citizenship and Rights in Multicultural Societies.* Keele: Keele University Press, 1995, pp. 44-51.

○ *PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF CIVILIZATIONAL DIALOGUE. THE HERMENEUTICS OF CULTURAL SELF-COMPREHENSION VERSUS THE PARADIGM OF CIVILIZATIONAL CONFLICT.* International Seminar on Civilizational Dialogue (3rd: 15-17 September 1997: Kuala Lumpur), BP171.5 ISCD. Kertas kerja persidangan / conference papers. Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Library, 1997.

○ (Ed., with Gudrun Grabher) *CIVILIZATIONS: CONFLICT OR DIALOGUE?* (Studies in International Relations, XXIV.) Vienna: International Progress Organization, 1999.

○ "THE CLASH OF CIVILIZATIONS REVISITED," in: Hans Kochler and Gudrun Grabher (eds.), *Civilizations: Conflict or Dialogue? (*Studies in International Relations, XXIV.) Vienna: International Progress Organization, 1999, pp. 15-24.

○ "MUSLIM-CHRISTIAN TIES IN EUROPE: PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE," in: *IKIM Journal*, vol. 7, no. 1 (January-June 1999), pp. 97-107.

° "THE CONCEPT OF THE STATE AND CITIZENS' RIGHTS IN A MULTICULTURAL SOCIETY," in: Y. N. Kly (ed.), *New Perspectives for Intercultural Dialogue and an Alternative Economic Order*. Atlanta (Georgia): Clarity Press, 1999, pp. 19-23.

° *THE BAKU DECLARATION ON GLOBAL DIALOGUE AND PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE AMONG NATIONS AND THREATS POSED BY INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM*. Baku, Azerbaijan, 9 November 2001.

° "AFTER SEPTEMBER 11, 2001: CLASH OF CIVILIZATIONS OR DIALOGUE?," in: *Forum. Popular na pahayag ng malayang komunidad* (Universidad ng Pilipinas), Diliman, Q. C., Tomo 3, Blg. 3, 28 March 2002, p. 9.

° "THE DIALOGUE OF CIVILIZATIONS: PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS, POLITICAL DIMENSIONS AND THE RELEVANCE OF INTERNATIONAL SPORTING EVENTS. Summary of the Statement," in: *World Cup Roundtable on Promoting Understanding among Cultures and Peoples*. Seoul: Korean National Commission for UNESCO, 2002, pp. 19-21.

° "THE 'CLASH OF CIVILIZATIONS,' THE PROBLEM OF TERRORISM AND STRATEGIES TOWARDS PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE AMONG NATIONS," in: *ASEM Youth Dialogue on Globalisation, 19-22 September 2002, Hillerød, Denmark*. Conference Presentations at http://www.asef.org/aeyc/active_dialogue_global_pre.html (2002).

° "THE DIALOGUE OF CIVILIZATIONS: PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS, CURRENT STATE AND PROSPECTS," in: *Asia Europe Journal*, vol. 1, no. 3 (August 2003), pp. 315-320.

° PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF CIVILIZATIONAL DIALOGUE: World Congress on Transcendent Philosophy and Mulla Sadra, Tehran, Iran (May 2004).

° *THE DIALOGUE OF CIVILIZATIONS AND THE FUTURE OF WORLD ORDER*. Foundation Day Speech, 43rd Foundation Day, Mindanao State University, Marawi City / Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao, Philippines (1 September 2004).